



ISSUED FOR THE INFORMATION OF MEMBERS

LIBRARY  
RECEIVED

## THE NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION

1512 H STREET NORTHWEST

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BULLETIN 25

January 30, 1922

# THE NATIONAL PARKS AND THE NATIONAL FORESTS

*Chief of the Forest Service Defines the Distinctions between these great classes of Public Reservations and Suggests the Repeal of the Pierce Amendment*

AS A contribution to national policy, we publish here nearly the whole of the statement of William B. Greeley, Chief of the Forest Service, made at the Barbour Bill hearing before the Public Lands Committee of the House on December 13, 1921. The omitted portions are technical details and discussions irrelevant to the question of policy.

At the time of this hearing, the unamended Barbour Bill called for the creation of the Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park subject to the application of the Water Power Act. A month later, the Committee favorably reported the bill amended to safeguard the new park from water power.

### MR. GREELEY'S STATEMENT

Since I have been in charge of the Forest Service I have been called upon to consider the creation of additional national parks, or additions to existing national parks, at a number of different points.

I would like to speak very briefly on the general questions of policy which these investigations have raised. I have approached all of these proposed park creations or additions from the standpoint of the qualifications or specifications which every national park should measure up to; and those, in my judgment, are two. The first is that the scenic attractions and natural wonders and beauties of the area must be of such outstanding importance as to be distinctly national in their character. Park areas should contain such exceptional mountain scenery, or combination of mountain scenery with water scenery, or natural wonders, that they are national in their distinctiveness and appeal. The second general specification which it has seemed to me every national park should meet is that its value for public service in the form of recreation and natural beauty should be outstanding in importance as compared with the value of the commercial resources of the area.

### Years of Study in Wisely Adjusting Boundaries

As the development of the Western States goes on it sometimes becomes rather a fine question whether in any given area the value of commercial resources represented by forage, timber, water power, minerals, etc., are greater or less than the value of that area to the public as a national playground and for its esthetic beauty or grandeur.

The map which you see before you represents the boundaries as they have resulted from some three or four years of study and adjustment on both sides. In adjusting those boundaries the most important areas of commercial timber have been eliminated from the proposed addition. Aside from the giant forests, the areas of commercial timber remaining within the area are of negligible extent and of negligible future importance to the forest industries of

California. We have also eliminated from the boundary the only important area where hitherto there has been any extensive mineral development near Mineral King.

We have eliminated from the boundaries of the proposed park the principal areas where existing use of the range would be disrupted, to the injury of the local live-stock interests. With the boundary now proposed, the creation of the park would cause no serious injury to the live stock growers of that region. Including the 60,000 acres of the existing Sequoia National Park, which by this bill could be put into the national forest, it is probable that all of the live stock now using the west side of the range can be fully accommodated. And it is probable that all the live stock using the east side of the range can be accommodated with other allotments within the national forest adjoining the proposed park on the south.

### The Policy of Eliminating Areas Needed for Commercial Development

Aside from the grazing of live stock, there is no established use of the area which will be adversely affected by the proposed park. The only question which remains as to the interference of the park with commercial development is that of water power.

It is true that there are a number of water-power sites within the boundaries proposed. There are undoubtedly additional possible water-power sites that have not yet been located. As you go back up those extremely rugged and precipitous canyons there are apt to be additional points where power development at some future time is conceivable.

I can not speak on the water-power question in the capacity of an expert, as I am not a power engineer. From the extent to which I have been able to study this question in relation to the needs of the State, my conclusion is that while there are feasible power developments within the proposed park, their actual use, considering the cost of engineering structures and available markets for the power, lies in the rather distant future.

### Power Possibilities Belong to Far Distant Future

I think it is true that engineers have passed upon most of the possible power sites as being impracticable of development under existing standards of cost. I think it is true that the actual need for this power lies in the future rather than in the present. I think it is true that the needs of the San Joaquin Valley for water storage in connection with irrigation can be met from reservoir sites in the lower hills outside the boundaries of the park for a long time. This is not to say that the day will not come when there

will be a demand for power and reservoir sites within this area. In my judgment, that day is many years hence, and in view of the great and distinctive value which this area has for recreational purposes and its national importance from that standpoint, I for one am prepared to urge that the use of the area for national park purposes be given the benefit of the doubt.

Possible future demands for the use of its power resources should be left for the future to determine, and be left definitely in the hands of Congress itself.

#### **National Parks Should Not Be National Forests Under Another Title**

I do not think we should create a national park without making it a real national park. It should not be a national forest under a different name. This question of recreation and scenic values on the one hand as compared with commercial values on the other should be frankly faced and settled. If the area is to be a national park, its recreational and scenic values should be fully and absolutely protected, so that they can not be broken into by commercial development unless Congress should so decide.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly of the opinion either that the bill now before you should be amended so as to exclude power development except by act of Congress or that *our general legislation dealing with water power should be modified to apply to future parks or park additions, as well as to national parks existing at the date of the present law.*

I do not think we should establish this national park under any other conditions. Congress may subsequently decide that commercial developments should be given right of way; *but as long as it is to be a national park it should be devoted wholly to park purposes.* If economic conditions ultimately require a change, that change should be made by Congress.

#### **We Must not Mix Two Classes of National Reservations**

As a matter of national policy, we should have one class of reservations which exist primarily for commercial use—that is, the national forests. We should have a second class of reservations established for recreation and the specific forms of development that contribute to recreation. I do not think we should mix those two purposes in our national parks.

*It is a question of the public land policy of the country. An important point of land policy like this, as to whether a particular area is to be available for commercial development, or whether it is to be developed exclusively for recreational and scenic values, should be settled by Congress. Unless Congress is willing to say that this area should be set aside exclusively for recreational development and the preservation of its natural beauties, I do not think Congress should make it a national park.*

#### **We Might as Well Recognize Frankly that Power Destroys Park Values**

One of the greatest attractions will be the canyons themselves, with their remarkable variety of topography. You cannot admit power development in canyons of that character, with artificial reservoirs and conduits, the erection of transmission lines, power dams, pipe lines and all the rest of it without largely destroying its natural character.

I have seen this come out in a good many places in the West. It is not complete destruction, but the wonders of that country as a piece of nature's handiwork are going to be largely destroyed if commercial development gets in.

We might just as well recognize that frankly. My advice is to settle the question on that point, whether Congress is prepared to dedicate this area to recreational use, or whether it believes that the area should be kept available for commercial development.

I can not conceive of an area being developed as a national park and giving the American people the service it should through preserving its natural beauties, while at the same time it is open to power development. I have seen how it works over and over again. *If it is to be a national park at all, let it be a 100 per cent national park.*

While we are developing our facilities for heat, light, and power we can not overlook the fact that we do need a few outstanding areas where nature is preserved for public benefit and enjoyment.

A thousand California canyons are available for power development. They will remain available in the national forest. I do not think it is asking too much to reserve two or three of the finest and best for their scenery and for public recreation. Of course, we would not want to spread national parks all over the mountains. We should limit them. This is one of the exceptionally fine places.

#### **Barbour Bill Should be Amended**

It is assumed that water-power development is not to be allowed within the park as established by the bill, but the bill is not clear on that point. To meet the situation, it is suggested that a new section be added to read substantially as follows:

*"No permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power within the limits of the Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park, as described herein, shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress."*

(Note: This was done January 13, 1922.)

#### **The Pierce Amendment Should Be Repealed**

The amendment suggested immediately above is offered as the simplest way of safeguarding the integrity of the Roosevelt-Sequoia Park. A better way to accomplish the same purpose, not only in the Roosevelt-Sequoia, but in other national parks as well, would be to amend the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat., 1353), so as to make it applicable to the Roosevelt-Sequoia and to any other national parks established or enlarged after the date of the passage of the act. This could best be accomplished by striking out of line 5 of the act the words "as now constituted," and by striking out from the next to the last line of the act the word "existing."

The elimination of these four words from the act referred to would safeguard all future national parks from water-power development.

The Act of March 3, 1921, which Mr. Greeley refers to just above, is our Jones-Esch Act releasing national parks from the application of the Water Power Act and restoring them to the sole control of Congress. The four words referred to, "as now constituted" and "existing" were added to the Act by the Pierce Amendment for the purpose of keeping all future national parks open to water-power by retaining them under the Water Power Act.

Mr. Greeley's suggestion to eliminate these four words, therefore, is a suggestion to repeal the Pierce Amendment.

The italics in the text of Mr. Greeley's address, above, are our own.

ice  
is  
or  
ole

a-  
it  
at  
ve  
a  
k.  
d  
a  
b-

er  
al  
vo  
b-  
d  
it

ee  
ee  
is  
a-

,  
r  
e  
d  
y

l  
e  
e  
a  
t  
e  
e